



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/711,583	09/27/2004	Michael BURR	2006579-0231 (CTX-093)	5582
69665 7590 03/24/2010 CHOATE, HALL & STEWART / CITRIX SYSTEMS, INC. TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE BOSTON, MA 02110				
EXAMINER HARRELL, ROBERT B				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2442				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/24/2010		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/711,583

**Applicant(s)**

BURR ET AL.

**Examiner**

Robert B. Harrell

**Art Unit**

2442

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-17,19,20,22,31,32,34-47,49,50 and 52 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-17,19,20,22,31,32,34-47,49,50 and 52 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 April 2009 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-940)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2442

1. Claims 1, 2, 4-17, 19, 20, 22, 31, 32, 34-47, 49, 50, and 52 are presented for examination.
2. The Substitute Specification, filed 16 March 2010, has been entered as there is now a statement that the Substitute Specification contains No New Matter.
3. Since the Substitute Specification has not been entered, there is no change to the title; hence, the title of the invention is still not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The proposed Substitute Specification title would be acceptable if re-worded as follows: "System And Method For Assigning Unique Network Identifiers To Each Program Executing On Computers".
4. The applicant should always use this period for response to thoroughly and very closely proof read and review the whole of the application for correct correlation between reference numerals in the textual portion of the Specification and Drawings along with any minor spelling errors, general typographical errors, accuracy, assurance of proper use for Trademarks <sup>TM</sup>, and other legal symbols ®, where required, and clarity of meaning in the Specification, Drawings, and specifically the claims (i.e., *provide proper antecedent basis for "the" and "said" within each claim*) with each claim ending in a period. Minor typographical errors could render a Patent unenforceable and so the applicant is strongly encouraged to aid in this endeavor.
5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this action:

**A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -**

(e) the invention was described in — (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language;

6. Claims 1, 2, 4-17, 19, 20, 22, 31, 32, 34-47, 49, 50, and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being anticipated Orme by (United States Patent Application Number: 2005/0097179 A1).

7. Prior to addressing the grounds of the rejections below, should this application ever be the subject of public review by third parties not so versed with the technology (i.e., access to IFW through Public PAIR (as found on <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>)), this Office action will usually refer an applicant's attention to relevant and helpful elements, figures, and/or text upon which the Office action relies to support the position taken. Thus, the following citations are neither all-inclusive nor all-exclusive in nature *as the whole of the reference is cited*

Art Unit: 2442

and relied upon in this action as part of the substantial evidence of record. Also, no temporal order was claimed for the acts and/or functions.

8. Per claim 1, Orme taught a system (e.g., see Abstract) for assigning a unique network identifier to each program invoked on a computer (e.g., see paragraph [00920] and paragraph [00921]), the system comprising:

a) a computer obtaining a plurality of network identifiers allocated to a user (e.g., see paragraph [00920] and paragraph [00921] such as IP addresses in the set of 127.0.0.1), the computer executing:

ai) an interface mechanism to select, from the plurality of network identifiers of the user, a first network identifier (i.e., 127.0.1.0) of the user for a first program invoked by the user on the computer (e.g., see paragraph [00920] and paragraph [00921]) and to select a second network identifier (i.e., 127.0.2.0) of the user, different from the first network identifier (127.0.1.0 < > 127.0.2.0), for a second program invoked by the user on the computer (e.g., see paragraph [00920] and paragraph [00921]), and to assign associating the first network identifier (127.0.1.0) the first program and to assign associating the second network identifier the second program (127.0.2.0) (e.g., see paragraph [00920] and paragraph [00921]); and,

aii) a network communication interface, in communication with the interface mechanism, to transmit the first network identifier with a network communication of the first program and to transmit the second network identifier with a network communication of the second program (e.g., see paragraph [00920] and paragraph [00922]).

9. Per claim 2, since the claim recites “one of either”, examiner needs only address one; hence, Orme taught a loopback address 127.0.0.1 per paragraph [00920] and paragraph [00922].

10. Per claim 4, a program can be anything in Orme such as the session of paragraph [0656].

11. Per claim 5, since the claim recites “one of either”, examiner needs only address one; hence, any program is also an application such as a chat session.

12. Per claim 6, claim 7, claim 8, and claim 9, since Orme taught a Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol in paragraph [0737] and paragraph [0918], the computer obtained the network identifier from the server per paragraph [0917] and paragraph [0918] which generated the identifier, or locally from a storage (i.e., statically assigned).

13. Per claim 10 and claim 11, see paragraph [0919] to paragraph [0926].

14. Per claim 12 and claim 13, as indicated above, the computer could host chat sessions (in the plural) per paragraph [0656].

15. Per claim 14 and claim 15, such is domain name resolution normal to DNS as covered, in part, in paragraph [0732] as allocated to a user of the computer.

Art Unit: 2442

16. Per claim 16, claim 17, claim 19, and claim 20, see paragraph [0922] for TCP stack and paragraph [0085] and paragraph [1135] for socket library and binding.

17. Per claim 22, in light of the applicant's originally filed specification on page 51 (paragraph [0082] in which the interface mechanism is intercepting and modifying network traffic sent to and from the program, Orme also taught the use of TCP/IP stacks and sockets for binding along with the use of the Secure Socket Layer per paragraph [1135] for intercepting and modifying network traffic sent (i.e., encrypting) to and from the programs.

18. Per claims 31, 32, 34-47, 49, 50, and 52, these claims do not teach or defined above the correspondingly rejected claims given above, and are thus rejected for the same reasons given above.

19. The rejections, and grounds for rejections, under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as presented in examiner's prior Office Action mailed 09 June 2009 and 16 December 2009, are hereby maintained and incorporated in this Office Action by reference.

20. The applicant argued in his 16 March 2010 response by stating in substance that claims 1, 2, 4-17, 19, 20, 22, 31, 32, 34-47, 49, 50 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0097179 to Orme et al. (hereinafter "Orme."). The applicant submit that Claims 1, 2, 4-17, 19, 20, 22, 31, 32, 34-47, 49, 50 and 52 as previously presented are patentable over Orme. A reference anticipates a claimed invention only when that reference discloses each and every element of the claimed invention. The applicant submit that Orme does not disclose: selecting from a plurality of network identifiers allocated to a user, assigning a selected network identifier of a user to a program invoked by that user. Each of these elements is required in each independent claim, e.g. Claims 1 and 31. The applicant wish to first point out that Orme does not disclose a plurality of network identifiers allocated to a user. Although Orme may describe an IP address of a user, Orme does not disclose a plurality of network identifiers allocated to a user. See Orme, paragraph 44. Even more, Orme does not disclose or suggest selecting from a plurality of network identifiers allocated to a user. Orme assigns an IP address from a group of IP addresses ranging from 127.0.0.1 to 127.255.255.255, or from a subnet, or from a group of IP addresses not already assigned to a local host computer or code segment. See Orme, paragraphs 920-921. None of these groups are a group of network identifiers allocated to a user, furthermore Orme never discloses or suggests that the above described IP addresses are allocated to a user. Thus, Orme does not disclose the limitation selecting from a plurality of network identifiers allocated to a user. In addition to not disclosing a plurality of network identifiers allocated to a user, Orme also does not disclose assigning a selected network identifier of a user to a program invoked by that user. As stated in the Response filed on September 9, 2009, and reiterated here with emphasis, Orme does not disclose assigning a network identifier to a program, where that network identifier is allocated to a user, and where the program is invoked by the user. The system described in Orme includes code segments or programs that are assigned IP addresses. As stated above, Orme never discloses or suggests that the IP address assigned to a code segment is in any way associated with a user. Similarly, Orme never discloses or suggests that the code segment is invoked by a user or that the code segment

Art Unit: 2442

has a network identifier associated with a user that invokes the code segment. Thus, Orme does not disclose the following limitations: assigning the first network identifier to the first program, and assigning the second network identifier to the second program, where the identifiers are an identifier of the user for a first program invoked by the user, and an identifier of the user for a second program invoked by the user. The applicant wish to clarify the record by pointing out that the Examiner's statements about Orme lack support because Orme never discloses allocating a user "at least two IP addresses to choose from when assigning one IP address to one section of code ... and another different IP address to the other section of code." See Office Action, mailed on December 16 2009, page 5. Orme never discloses or even suggests that a user chooses an IP address, or that a user assigns an IP address to a section of code. What is more, Orme is entirely silent as to whom or what assigns an IP address to a section of code. In light of the above remarks. The applicants submit that Claims 1 and 31 are patentable over Orme because Orme does not disclose each and every limitation of the claimed invention. The applicant further submit that Claims 2, 4-17, 19, 20, 22, 32, 34-47, 49, 50 and 52 are patentable over Orme because these claims depend on and incorporate the patentable subject matter of Claims 1 and 31. Accordingly, The applicant earnestly request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection and pass the claims to issuance. *However*, as indicate above, Orme taught that a computer user had several programs on one computer per paragraph [0915], or sections of code per paragraph [0942], on the user's computer, each program, or section of code, had their own IP address. Since paragraph [0942] taught at least two sections of codes, or programs, then the user must been allocated at least two IP addresses to choose from when assigning one IP address to one section of code, program, and another different IP address to the other section of code, program. Hence, Orme disclosed, *among many other things*, assigning a first network identifier to a first program and a second network identifier to a second program where (1) the first network identifier and the second identifier are selected from a plurality of network identifiers of a user, and (2) where the plurality of network identifiers are allocated to the user. Hence, Orme disclosed assigning to an application an IP address allocated to a user; and, Orme suggested that the application should be associated with a user. Furthermore, Orme disclosed obtaining IP addresses or other network identifiers from a group of IP addresses assigned to a particular user, that group being within the range given in paragraph [0920] and paragraph [0921]. Therefore, Orme does disclose a user, since the user uses the computer, selecting from a plurality of network identifiers allocated to a user, assigning a selected network identifier by a user to a program invoked by that user, as indicated above. Also, Orme does disclose a plurality of network identifiers allocated to a user such as in the range from 127.0.0.1 to 127.255.255.255; and hence, Orme discloses and/or suggests that the above described IP addresses are allocated to a user since the user is using the computer and is there for the user to assign to individual programs. In conclusion, the user can assign an IP address, for example, 127.1.1.1 to a first program and 127.2.2.2, or any combination of address different from one another to each program, to another program. Hence each program, like servers or machines, can have their own unique IP address.

**21. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (see MPEP 710.02, 710.02(b)).**

Art Unit: 2442

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert B. Harrell whose telephone number is (571) 272-3895. The examiner can normally be reached Monday thru Thursday from 5:30 am to 2:00 pm.

23. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar, can be reached on (571) 272-4006. The fax phone number for all papers is (571) 273-8300.

24. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

25. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Robert B. Harrell/  
ROBERT B. HARRELL  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
Art Unit 2442